DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 299 SP 015 581

TITLE Teach: Teacher Education and Children with Handicaps. Vol. 1, No. 3, May/June 1979.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE May 79
NOTE 7p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Teaching: Educational Legislation; *Handicapped Children; Individualized Instruction; *Mainstreaming; *Special Education; *Teacher Education; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Progress reports are given on the preparation of teachers for teaching handicapped children in the regular classroom. Discussions are presented on specific program developments in Massachusetts, competencies needed by regular classroom teachers for successful mainstreaming, the implications of Public Law 94-142, and the philosophy of mainstreaming. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED182299

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Edward Pomeroy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

# TEACH

Teacher Education and Children with Handicaps

DEDICATED TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL PREPARATION PROGRAMS FOR ALL EDUCATORS FOR EDUCATING THE HANDICAPPED

Vol. 1, No. 3

May/June 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

## AACTE STATE UNITS REPORT PROGRESS

Approximately thirty-four State Units of AACTE held meetings this spring discussing the implications for teacher education of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. Reports from AACTE State Leaders indicate that increased communication was evident, as a result of the meetings, between teacher educators and State Departments of Education and between institutions with federal funding to respond to the law and those without. Some specific activities of AACTE institutions or State Units are reported below:

### IMPETUS FOR CHANGE IN GEORGIA

"Teachers teach as they've been taught, not as they've been taught to teach"—an adage applicable to the current labeling and segregation within programs for pre-service teachers. Should not the efforts toward de-labeling children apply to programs preparing teachers to de-label? Shouldn't IHEs move toward an arrangement which more closely approximates the real world of the public schools for which the teachers are being prepared? Educators in Georgia are seeking answers.

Although Georgia has been ranked number ten in the nation in the area of programs for the handicapped, the compilation of the State of the Scene Data requested by AACTE augmented the need for reconceptualizing delivery mechanisms, beginning with the SDE, moving through IHEs and LEAs, and culminating in the least restrictive environment for all.

Georgia was one of the earlier states to legislate that all teachers and administrators complete a five hour course, or its equivalent, in the education of exceptional children (HB 671, 1975). However, the course is too often geared toward identification only; one "mandated" course cannot provide for all the needed changes in attitudes, competencies, and skills. Further, the course has been offered as a separate component, rather than an integral part of the program.

These and other issues were covered at the AACTE sponsored one-day workshop, held during the regularly scheduled GACTE conference in order to facilitate attendance by Deans of Education. Other participants included IHE Directors of Special Education, LEA administrators representing both regular and special education, and an SDE representative.

The introduction to the program, the rationale for PL 94-142 and Section 504 and implications for teacher education programs was presented by a regular and special education IHE faculty. The synopsis of the laws was presented by an LEA Special Education Director.

A presentation of six Dean's Grants proposed for 1979-80 instigated a stimulating discussion concerning changes that could be made in IHEs without funding.

The highlight of the workshop was a potpourri by a panel of LEA administrators who clearly articulated their needs for teachers who were more adequately prepared to serve the handicapped in regular programs, as well as suggestions as to how these changes could be brought about.

While many of the following endeavors were already in the initial states, they received impetus for finalization, implementation, and/or restructuring from the GACTE workshop held in Georgia (January, 1979). These approaches toward minimizing the dualism in teacher education programs are evidenced at several levels.

At the state level the Comprehensive System of Personnel Development of the Annual Program Plan for Public Law 94-142, prepared by representatives from Special Education, SDE, Georgia Learning Resource Systems and the Special Education Advisory Board, will now include *regular* educators from LEAs and IHEs.

*IHEs.* The mandated course in special education has gained relevancy through team teaching by a regular educator and a special educator. While the special educator explains the handicapping condition, the regular educator clarifies the role of the teacher integrating the child into the total class environment. Consequently, the fears and misconceptions of teachers are being dealt with prior to entry into the job market.

Other changes at the IHE level include:

*—Seminars conducted for all regular faculty.*

*—Development of a four course sequence for pre-service teachers who elect to minor in special education.*

*—Encouragement of regular college faculty to take a survey course in Special Education.*

*—Offering of dual majors in early Childhood and Special Education.*

*—Placement of students in practicum sites where regular teachers are most effectively serving the handicapped.*

*—Use of special educators as resource persons in courses designed for skills in teaching subject matter areas and curriculum to facilitate infusion of the handicapped child component.*

*—Teaming of future teachers of handicapped learners with regular pre-service teachers for group projects in methods courses.*

*—Requirement that simulated leson plans of regular teachers include appropriate modifications for the handicapped learner.*

SP015581

*—Staff Development seminars conducted for LEAs as follow-up to the required course, Introduction to the Exceptional Child.*

*—Development of a special course in delivery of services to the handicapped as a part of the courses for a major in administration.*

*—The teaching of Behavior Management, required for all middle school majors, by a member of the Special Education faculty.*

*Jewel M. Wade*
*Director, Special Education*
*North Georgia College*

## PROGRESS IN MASSACHUSETTS

Representatives of nine Massachusetts colleges and universities told how their institutions are implementing PL 94-142 at a Special Education Manpower Project conference held at Regis College in Weston on May 18. Responding to an invitation from Ms. Cynthia Gilles, director for this Department of Education project, each speaker described the program development alternative chosen for preparing regular educators at the pre-service level to fulfill their responsibilities in the education of exceptional children.

Described was a wide variety of alternatives to program development. All nine institution strive to prepare all teachers in pre-service programs to implement the concepts in PL 94-142. Some approach this by retraining regular faculty while others offer new alternatives to students.

Self training by the regular faculty was the alternative chosen by Regis College. Sr. Julia Ford told how books had been obtained for faculty to read and share, how films and filmstrips were being viewed and discussed, how professors slowly were modifying their courses to include for the benefit of their students the knowledge, skills, and attitudes gained through deliberate study. The faculty of Regis College seek to overcome the lack of knowledge and skill that can hamper program change by retraining themselves.

Through a Deans' Grant Project, Westfield State College is providing workshops for secondary students and faculty aimed at modifying courses and retooling faculty members both in secondary and special education. Elaine Cuphone, graduate assistant, reported some early program successes.

At Bridgewater State College the governance system is considering a recommendation to disestablish the popular special education department and reassign its faculty members to regular education departments for the purposes of forming a conceptual framework reflective of the public schools and for cross-training special and regular educators.

Boston College's early Deans' Grant produced an integrated program featuring team teaching by regular and special educators. Dr. Jean Mooney outlined a multiple-option curriculum which emphasizes preparation for human service professions.

Fitchburg State College offers a multi-option program and, according to Professor Carla Borg, encourages students to elect preparation in human services.

Other colleges have developed special education alternatives for regular education students. Special education minors or concentrations were described by Patricia Prendergast, director of teacher education at North Adams State College, Mary Brassard, professor of education at Framingham State College, Edna Mauriello, professor of education at Salem State College, and Duane Kuik, associate professor of education at Gordon College.

*Ray Harper, Dean*
*Division of Professional Education*
*Bridgewater State College*
*and*
*AACTE State Liaison Representative*
*for Massachusetts*

At the Nebraska ACTE State meeting it was learned that Kearney State College in Kearney, Nebraska anticipates that its revised teacher education program, developed without benefit of federal funding, will be implemented this fall. The revised program will include content specific to education of the handicapped in a Professional Studies Semester. The content will take the form of a specific course, a semester that is team taught with a course specific to education of the handicapped, or such content will be integrated throughout the work of the semester. . . . . The Idaho ACTE plans another meeting this fall which will focus in part on "mainstreaming" activities within institutions in Idaho that do not have Deans' Grants. The meeting will facilitate continued dialogue and cooperation with the Idaho State Department of Education . . . . . In Indiana more conferences will be held to determine how to cooperatively and most effectively use resources within the state to deliver the needed programs as outlined by the state . . . . . .Concluding from the Iowa state meeting that much more response by IHEs to the law is needed, the IACTE has suggested that continued contact be kept with the Midwest Regional Resource Center to establish a base for future efforts . . . . . The New Jersey ACTE will invite a representative from the State Department of Education to meet with NJACTE in the fall to discuss personnel preparation and the Annual Program Plan for Education of the Handicapped . . . . . At the meeting of the New England Association of Teacher Educators, in cooperation with AACTE, the Rhode Island ACTE reports that teacher educators heard presentations on staff development and curriculum change for P.L. 94-142 at both the pre-service and inservice level and participated in group discusssions. Included were models of effective inservice practice, a workshop in identification of issues that impede staff development, and reports of experience from Deans' Grants institutions. An additional focus was certification requirements in response to the law. Participants included representatives from the State Departments of Education in addition to teacher educators in the New England States . . . . . The Pennsylvania ACTE leadership expressed the need after that state meeting for more explicit models for program change, more coordination with special educators within individual institutions, and more effective planning with school districts. Participants in the Pennsylvania state meeting heard presentations from a variety of sources, including representatives from the five Deans' Grants projects within the state, Deans' Grants Liaison representatives for the northeastern states, the State Department of Education, local administrators, parents, and regular and special educators.

## *What Competencies Do Regular Classroom Teachers Need?*

Implementation of P.L. 94-142 forces educators to address the question of what competencies are needed by classroom teachers if they are to serve handicapped pupils adequately in regular classrooms. At the recent annual meeting of Deans' Grants Project Directors in St. Paul – a meeting sponsored by BEH's National Support Systems Project (NSSP) – participants devoted a major portion of their time in attempting to answer this question.

A major focus was reactions to a paper developed by Maynard Reynolds of the NSSP and colleagues. The paper entitled, "A Common Body of Practice for Teachers: The Challenge of P.L. 94-142 to Teacher Education" presents nine competency clusters relevant to all teachers and education of the handicapped. In support of this tentative list of competency clusters, Robert Howsam, University of Houston, stressed the point that federal legislation for education of the handicapped challenges schools and colleges of education to make basic and needed reforms in their teacher education programs. The nine competency clusters are:

1. *Curriculum:* The preparation of all teachers should include study of and first-hand experience with curriculum principles, guides, and structures from preschool through secondary levels. All major subjects that are systematically taught in schools by professionals should be included. The means and procedures by which curriculum is developed, adopted, and changed should be understood and there should be practice in designing and modifying curriculum, especially to suit the individual needs of students.

2. *Teaching Basic Skills:* The preparation of all teachers should include necessary elements to assure competency in teaching the basic skills. Instruction should be provided in teaching the skill areas as such. In addition, supervised practical experience should be provided in simulated laboratory and field settings, and should include teaching of literacy skills, life maintenance skills, and personal development skills.

3. *Pupil and Class Management:* All teachers should be proficient in pupil and class management procedures, including applied behavior analysis, group alerting, guiding transitions, materials arrangement, crisis intervention techniques, and group approaches to creating positive affective climate.

4. *Professional Interactions:* It is essential now that all teachers have opportunities to master the knowledge and practices involved in effective consultation and other forms of communication. To accomplish this goal, every educator should have instruction and practicum experience leading to assured capability to understand and to carry on at a safe level all the exchanges and counter-exchanges that are fundamental to adequate performance in the interactions discussed above.

5. *Student-student Relationships:* All teachers should be able to convey to students the attitude that they bear some of the responsibility for their social environment and must be willing to help one another. Also, teachers need to be prepared to manage the social structure of their classes by generating cooperative, mutually helpful behavior among the students. Teachers need specific insights into and skills for developing heterogeneously cooperative grouping procedures and peer and cross-age tutoring. They also should be able to teach students to use some of the basic counseling/guidance skills in relationships with other students.

6. *Exceptional Conditions:* All prospective teachers should have preparation in understanding exceptional children, in school procedures for accommodating to children's special needs, and in the roles of specialists who serve exceptional children. Moreover, hands-on experiences with the children and conferences with their parents ought to be provided.

7. *Conferral and Referral:* Every teacher should have training in how communities organize and conduct their agencies for social welfare, health, and education. Teachers and other members of the education profession should have systematic instruction in the roles and functions of:
   1. Referral sources within the school structure, and
   2. Agencies outside the schools that accept referrals.

   Teachers need to learn the generally accepted procedures for referrals, the responsibilities involved, and the ways to capitalize on referral resources in behalf of better education for individual pupils. They must be skilled in making systematic observations to provide data and undergird judgments for the referral process. There should be opportunities to obtain firsthand experience in how both in-school and community agencies operate.

8. *Individualized Teaching.* All teachers should be competent at the clinical level in the assessment of the individual student's educational needs and in adapting instruction to the individual. Starting from the first week of teacher preparation, and continuing until its completion, trainees should be in the company of experienced teachers who individualize education expertly.

9. *Professional Values:* Much more detailed and powerful codes of ethical behavior should be included in the pre-service and inservice education of teachers. Detail is needed so examples of acceptable behavior can be studied and internalized. Detail is needed, also, in order to minimize ambiguity and uncertainty. The codes must be powerful in the sense that they are morally and ethically persuasive and in the sense that the sanctions that result from breaking them are strong and vigorously enforced.
   School law, and the regulations that relate to it, should become part of the foundation of preparation for all educators. Teachers, particularly, need to be thoroughly knowledgeable about the interactions of law and education. The knowledge is necessary for the safeguarding of pupils' rights, for self-protection, for intelligent professional and political reaction, and for advocacy when new laws are needed or old ones should be changed.

A basic issue that surfaced repeatedly throughout the discussions of these competency clusters was whether or not it is possible to provide an adequate preparation program for teachers within all of the constraints of a four-year time period in a college or university. Some participants argued that it was not possible; others were not sure.

The program included a number of presentations by several educators in response to Reynolds' paper. NSSP plans to publish these reaction papers later this fall together with a final revision of Reynolds' paper. Another program element was a presentation on change strategies by John Bryson, Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota. Deans' Grants Project Directors also met in small groups to discuss the program topics and to share experiences at their respective institutions.

## INFORMATION EXCHANGE

- "I'm A Lot Like You" is an instructional materials program designed for use at both the pre-service and inservice levels to prepare regular education teachers to work with handicapped students in their classrooms. Developed at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, it consists of 25 modules on various topics relating to education of the handicapped. They include a series of video tapes accompanied by activities and materials intended for use in group instructions. "I'm A Lot Like You" was developed on the premise that mildly handicapped students are more "alike" than "different" and the principles and strategies used to teach special students are similar to those used to teach any student. The three major areas of the modules are understanding, diagnosing, and programming for individual differences. There is both an elementary and secondary series with flexibility built into the modules within the series so that they may be used with other professionals and parents. A brochure on the materials will be sent upon request and a preview tape giving an overview of the entire project at the university and showing samples of each module is available. Modules may be purchased individually for approximately $60.00 or the entire set, including preview tapes are: Elementary series, $910.00; Secondary series, $730.00. Contact: The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, "I'm A Lot Like You", Department of Exceptional Education, P.O. Box 413, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53207, (414) 963-6567.

- Proposals for new Dean's Grants are due at the Divisior of Personnel Preparation of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped on October 15, 1979. Continuation proposals are due September 15. To be put on the mailing list to receive application information in July, a written request to be put on the list should be sent to Dr. Jasper Harvey, Division of Personnel Preparation, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20202. Other technical questions, such as coincidence of proposals with state funding cycles should be addressed to BEH Project Officers. It is anticipated that additional technical assistance will be offered through AACTE and the National Support Systems Project of the University of Minnesota.

- "Educating the Handicapped: Millions for Media, Training, and Personnel (1979)" is a report released by the National Audio Visual Association (NAVA) which describes programs pertaining to the handicapped, early childhood, school age, and job training, which are supported by federal funds. This publicatiion also reviews how to obtain federal funding and who is eligible to apply for it. The report is available for $10 from NAVA, 3150 Spring Street, Fairfax, VA 22031.

- The BEH Deans' Project at the University of Kansas in Lawrence has developed a series of three modules to prepare regular educators for working with the handicapped in pre-service and inservice education programs. Each series contains units which have student objectives, activities and suggested readings. Series I, Characteristics and Assessment is priced at $2.70 a copy. Series II, Planning and Instruction and Series III, Instructional Management are $4.90 a copy. The entire set can be obtained for $12.25. For further information contact: Kansas Union Bookstore, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045 – ATT: Mrs. Hazel Pape.

- "Activities for Involvement: In-service Ideas for Attitudinal Change" is a publication of Project P.R.E.P. (Preparing Regular Educational Personnel) at Augustana College in South Dakota. This booklet contains a compilation of simulation activities, games and inservice workshops designed to sensitize regular education personnel to the needs of people with disabilities. To obtain a copy contact: Kent Gerlach, Director, Project P.R.E.P., Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D. 57102.

- The Preservice/Inservice Project of the University of Northern Colorado has developed a series of units designed for preparing general educators with skills and knowledge to work with handicapped students integrated into regular classes. Each unit includes a list of specific competencies or skills which the unit activities attempt to teach. Units have been developed with instructional activities containing suggestions, media, resources and related materials for flexible use by college faculty or inservice instructors to use in courses or workshops. The activities are written as lesson plans and materials related to the lessons are either appended or referenced. There is one series for elementary educators and one series in process for secondary educators. Contact: Barbara J. Fowler, Project Director, or Cliff Baker, University of Northern Colorado, School of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Greeley, Colorado 80639, (303) 351-2538, for further information.

- The AACTE Deans' Seminar to be held July 22-25 in Colorado Springs, Colorado will feature as one of the program components a session on P.L. 94-142 and Teacher Education. The major presenter for this session is Catherine Morsink, Director of Special Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington and a member of the AACTE Committee on Education of the Handcapped. An open forum will follow this presentation. This Seminar is sponsored by the Association's Commission on Programs and Projects and is designed to serve the needs of recently appointed and longstanding deans, associate/assistant deans, department heads and those interested in becoming a dean. Registration spaces are still available. For further information contact: Karl Massanari or Shirley Bonneville, AACTE, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Phone: (202) 293-2450.

- The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) is moving toward recognition of education for the handicapped in the accreditation standards for teacher education programs. Additional preamble wording in the section dealing with curricula which has been presently adopted by the Council is: "Permeating each component is a recognition that the teacher preparation curriculum emphasize the individual and special needs of exceptional people."

## *MAINSTREAMING IN THE REAL WORLD— IS IT FEASIBLE?*

"You're in the real world now" is a phrase which accompanies congratulatory handshakes and hugs that college graduates receive. Being a recent college graduate, I have heard that phrase frequently. Indeed, I am on the threshold of entering the "real" world. My college training, which I consider excellent, has prepared me for a job in special education and elementary education. My rationale for pursuing a double major stems from my belief that the improvement of educational opportunities for handicapped persons requires a solid background in both elementary and special education.

I am well versed in the P.L. 94-142 jargon. Classroom instruction and student teaching has involved me in diagnosing children with handicaps and writing individual education plans (IEPs). I have also attended meetings to decide pupil placement, which means placing a child in the least restrictive environment that will be most beneficial for the child. In many cases the least restrictive environment will be achieved by mainstreaming the child. My concern is about the feasibility of mainstreaming in my "real" world of dealing with both regular and special children.

Mainstreaming involves cooperation between the regular classroom teacher and the special education teacher who provides support services. Unfortunately, this relationship is often competitive and lacks communication. During my student teaching experiences, I heard regular teachers complain that special education teachers didn't have as many duties as they have. The regular classroom teachers pointed out that special education teachers didn't have as many students, didn't supervise lunch periods, and had less papers to grade. On the other hand, special education teachers complained that regular teachers couldn't control their students and didn't have to write IEPs for all their students.

At the schools where my student teaching took place, several examples of this lack of cooperation existed. The regular teacher would forget to send a student for special help and the special education teacher wouldn't send for the child. In another case, the special education teacher sent uncorrected work of a child back to the regular classroom. Because of the regular teacher's unwillingness to cooperate with the special education teacher in correcting the child's work, many uncorrect answers were overlooked. Consequently, the child had learned an incorrect method in place of the correct one. In another case, the special education teacher was upset because the regular classroom teachers weren't referring all the handicapped children. On the other hand, the teachers who referred children found that the special education teacher didn't have enough time to spend with the children. Numerous examples of lack of cooperation can be cited, but the only person who emerged as the loser in this conflict is the child.

Why not replace this animosity and competition with cooperation and communication? Special education teachers need to understand that a regular teacher must try to meet the needs of all 25-plus students at one time. That task is a difficult one considering that the students are on different educational levels. In turn, the regular teacher should not feel threatened by suggestions offered by a special education teacher who has been trained to provide the individual help that handicapped children need.

During my student teaching, I also saw evidence of cooperation and communication. It was heartwarming to see regular teachers and special education teachers overjoyed when a student had achieved a major success because of the combined efforts of the students and *both* teachers. I have seen regular teachers seek advice from special education teachers on how to teach a particular skill. Conversely, I have seen special education teachers ask what they can do to facilitate what the student is doing in the regular classroom.

Is mainstreaming feasible in the "real" world? Yes, I believe it is, if teachers communicate and cooperate with each other. I hope that when I begin teaching either as a regular teacher with "mainstreamed" children or special education teacher, the atmosphere of cooperation will prevail. With the coordinated efforts of BOTH teachers, the child will emerge a winner, and that, in my opinion, is what teaching is all about!

*Cathy Bonneville*
*Graduate, Western Kentucky University*

### Supreme Court Decision and Admission of the Handicapped to Professional Programs

The U.S. Supreme Court issued a decision on June 11 on the first case ever relating to Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Section 504 prohibits discrimination against the handicapped in federally assisted programs.

The Supreme Court held that there was no violation of Section 504 when Southeastern Community College denied admission to the nursing program to Frances B. Davis because of her hearing disability. The Court's decision responds to whether Section 504, which prohibits discrimination against an "otherwise qualified handicapped individual" in federally funded programs, forbids schools from imposing physical qualifications for admission.

The Court defines "otherwise qualified" as the ability "to meet all of a program's requirements in spite of his handicap." The HEW regulations "reinforce, rather than contradict this conclusion," in the opinion of the Court. In the regulations a qualified handicapped person must also meet "technical standards," which refer to all nonacademic admissions criteria essential to participation in a program. The opinion of the Court is that these criteria may include "necessary physical qualifications."

Mrs. Davis' argument that Southeastern should provide supervision by faculty when she attended patients and that certain courses could be dispensed with as long as she would be able to perform some duties or hold some positions of a registered nurse found some support in HEW regulations, particularly the provision that "requires covered institutions to make 'modifications' in their programs to accommodate handicapped persons, and to provide 'auxiliary aids' such as sign-language interpreters."

The opinion of the Court is that "nothing less than close, individual attention by a nursing instructor would be sufficient to ensure patient safety if respondent took part in the clinical phase of the nursing program," and Southeastern could permit her to take only academic classes because of her "inability to function in clinical courses without close supervision. . . .Such a fundamental alteration in the nature of a program is far more than the 'modification' the regulation requires."

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

Dear Editor:

In the January 1979 issue of TEACH, the article "Public Law 94-142: A Call for a Profession with Values" cogently defined the major obstacle to any reasonable success towards the pragmatic implementation of P.L. 94-142. This major obstacle is expressed in the appeal:

> The professional status of teaching and teacher education will be recognized when the corpus of validated knowledge and skills to which teachers and teacher educators subscribe is clearly identified and the public recognizes that the teaching profession possesses the skills and knowledge to perform a service that is a matter of life and death to this society and its people.

The basis for the successful implementation of this tenet resides more with the teacher educators than with teachers or even school administrators, . . . since as this article avers . . ., our public schools very much represent mirror images of the conditions present in teacher education. Consequently, poor soil for the maturation of the tremendous potentials inherent within P.L. 94-142 will remain, until direct measures are taken to vastly improve teacher educators.

The illusion of progressive teacher education to meet current needs (such as P.L. 94-142) is too often satisfied by simply changing the course title without affecting the common denominator: the training/experiences and educational biases of the teacher educator. Minor alterations of dog-eared class lecture notes, or copious acquisition of recent complimentary textbooks, hardly suffices for the study and practicum experience necessary for effective teaching of children with varying special needs. On the contrary, the expertise of educators with years of direct experience working with handicapped persons should be highly valued and used to augment all of teacher education. As a bonus to producing teachers who are more realistically qualified to teach handicapped children within the public school classrooms, we will also provide better teacher educators for the future.

To insure its novel and just objectives, P.L. 94-142 requires accountability by the public schools in the manner in which they provide training programs for handicapped students. Might not this accountability be more productively achieved by also requiring accountability of teacher education programs in the manner of their training teachers and school administrators who must implement P.L. 94-142? Might then our public schools produce far fewer learning disabled children, as well as best serve those who come to them handicapped? This accountability might begin with the subsidization of teacher education programs for studies on improvement of their programs for preparing teachers to serve in the front lines of education—the classrooms.

To argue that such accountability would be governmental infringement upon the sacred academic freedom of teacher education, a case might be made for the many years teacher education has taken vast sums of public money while neglecting the sacred rights of normal, as well as handicapped children, to an education to realize their potentials and aspirations for a valued, meaningful life. No group, teacher education or otherwise, has the right to enjoy such an exclusive double-standard of freedom.

(Excerpts From A Letter)

*Bernard-thomas Hartman*
*Professor, Department of School Services*
*Stephen F. Austin State University*

TEACH, issued periodically, reflects the Association's commitment to the advocacy of total responsiveness to individual differences, whatever their nature. Specifically, it addresses the improvement of personnel preparation programs for all educators for educating the handicapped.

TEACH is developed and disseminated as an activity of AACTE's Project, Institutional Capacity Building to Support PL 94-142, and funded by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, USOE. The Project's Advisory Council is chaired by Dean C. Corrigan, Dean, College of Education, University of Maryland. AACTE's Advisory Council of State Representatives, the major dissemination and training network for the Project, is chaired by Mark C. Smith, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of Arizona.

*Edward C. Pomeroy,* Executive Director, AACTE
*Karl Massanari,* Project Director
*Diane Merchant,* Assistant Director and EDITOR
*Shirley Bonneville,* Program Associate
*Janet Firshein,* Secretary

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education
Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

*Permission is hereby granted to duplicate TEACH for wider dissemination.*

AACTE/BEH PROJECT
Suite 610
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036

Nonprofit
Organization
U.S. Postage
**PAID**
Washington, D.C.
Permit No.
41892